

Application Serial No. 10/501,043  
Reply to Office Action of December 27, 2007

PATENT  
Docket: CU-3831

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 171 -226 have been allowed, except for minor typographical errors that were cited in the office action as requiring correction. Paragraph 1 of the office action stated that, “[a] new set of claims must be submitted....” (Emphasis in original)

Since the allowed claims were not rejected on prior art and were only objected to because of a few incorrect status identifiers, the applicant understands the Examiner’s to mean that the various incorrect status identifiers of the allowed claims must be corrected and submitted as “new” corrected claims.

The claim listing set forth above amends claim 187 to be dependent from claim 171. The claim listing also provides corrected status identifiers for claims 215, 216, 219, 220, 222 and 225. Since a status identifier *per se* is not part of a claim, the applicant’s representative contends that it would be improper to show revisions to the status identifiers using the USPTO notation. In other words, it would be improper to show an improper status identifier as being corrected using amendatory notation:

215. (New)– (Previously presented) An infrastructure system ...

The claim list above has instead been revised to provide the proper status identifier for claims that were identified in the office action, rather than amending the status identifiers as if they were part of the claim *per se*. The claims should now be in condition for allowance.

Sincerely,

Dated: May 22, 2008



Joseph P. Krause, Reg. No. 32,578  
Ladas & Parry  
224 South Michigan Avenue  
Chicago, Illinois 60604  
(312) 427-1300